

## REMARKS

Applicant herein submits an RCE and responds to the 3/18/10 Office Action and the 5/12/10 Advisory Action. Claims 3-5 and 7 have been cancelled and claims 1, 2, 6, 8-20 have been amended in this response. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-20 are currently pending.

### Drawings

The drawings are being resubmitted as directed in the Advisory Action.

### Claim Rejection 103

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6045671 to Wu (Wu) with or without a combination with other art. Applicant appreciates Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action and has clarified claim 1 of the present invention to show that the amount of power to each gun in the cluster is individually controlled (see, for example, Table 1). While Wu may disclose varying the power of two electron beam sources, the power is not individually controlled for each gun. One skilled in the art would recognize the unique features of the present invention and would not have thought the present invention obvious in light of Wu or Wu combined with any of the other art cited.

In view of the novel features of claim 1, and in that all the remaining claims depend on claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that this application is patentably distinguishable over the cited art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.


### Conclusion

As evidenced by the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in form to be passed to allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or suggestions, applicants' undersigned attorney requests that the Examiner initiate a telephone call to expedite prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Edwin M. Baranowski  
Reg. No. 27,482  
Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur LLP  
41 South High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Phone: (614) 227-2188  
FAX: (614) 227-2100



Melanie Martin-Jones  
Reg. No. 50,321